REMARKS

Review and reconsideration of the Final Office Action, dated January 29, 2009, is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 19 has been rewritten in independent form.

Claim 20 has been added. Support for new Claim 20 can be found on Claim 11. Claim 20 corresponds to Claim 11 having the closed transitional phrase "consisting of".

No new matter has been added to the claims by the present amendment.

FURTHERMORE, THE EXAMINER IS RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED TO CONTACT THE UNDERSIGNED AT THE INDICATED TELEPHONE NUMBER TO CONFIRM THE DATE AND TIME SET ON THE ATTACHED INTERVIEW REQUEST.

Applicants believe that the present set of claims is novel and not obvious over the cited reference.

Applicants' comments regarding the differences between the present invention and the cited reference can be found below.

Office Action

Turning now to the Office Action, the paragraphing of the Examiner is adopted.

Paragraphs 1-3 (Rejection – Prior Art)

The Examiner rejects Claim 11 to 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over admitted prior art (hereafter called APA) in view of 03/086744).

The position of the Examiner can be found on pages 2-4 of the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully traverses.

The present set of claims contains three independent claims, namely, Claim 11 19, and 20.

The following remarks are addressed to independent Claims 11, 19, and 20, because if these claims are not anticipated or obvious, it follows that none of the other rejected dependent claims are anticipated or obvious.

Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner that all of the independent claims require a system that includes **two totally different types of gluing**, 1) one for the closing of the bags that is supplemented with a strip of reinforcement and 2) another different one which unites the leaves that form the bags.

APA REFERENCE

Compared with independent Claims 11, 19, and 20, the APA fails to teach: 1) a plate having a plurality of parallel rows **raising** from the plate and forming a series of **crests** and **valleys**; 2) the crests are disposed longitudinally in the direction of rotation of the gluing roller applicator; 3) the glue only impregnates the crests; and 4) the gluing points are **raised** from the surface of the ruler guide.

Compared with independent Claim 19, the APA **further** fails to teach that 5) the gluing points further comprise a longitudinal groove.

Applicant notes that the Examiner already recognized that the APA reference already fails to teach points 1 and 3 (page 3 of the outstanding Office Action). In view of this, Applicant will not provide comments regarding points 1 and 3.

Regarding point 2 (the crests are disposed longitudinally in the direction of rotation of the gluing roller applicator).

As the Examiner already recognized, the APA reference fails to teach a plate having a plurality of parallel rows raising from the plate and forming a series of crests and valleys; thus, it can be deducted from the above that the reference does not teach that the crests are disposed longitudinally in the direction of rotation of the gluing roller applicator.

Regarding point 4 (gluing points are raised from the surface of the ruler guide)

Applicant notes that the gluing points of the APA are connected to the ruler guides by a **support equipped with a lower shaft** which is threaded around the said power strip and **an upper shaft** which is threaded around the glue point.; thus, the gluing points do not raise from the surface of the ruler guide.

The design of the present invention is simple and does not require a series of shafts to place the gluing point on the ruler guide; thus, by raising the gluing point with respect to the surface of the ruler guide, only the top surface of the gluing point contacts the glue and prevents accumulation of glue.

Regarding point 5 (the gluing points further comprises a longitudinal groove).

Applicant notes that the APA reference is silent regarding gluing points having a longitudinal groove.

APA teaches that the roller applicator has on its surface a plate or special band of rubber or a similar rough surface, containing small cells in which the glue is deposited and transferred to the flaps of the paper sheets for their closure, shaping the bottom of the bags.

A person skilled in the art will recognize that until the present invention was known, in the manufacture of bags, solid rollers having rough surfaces were placed in a cross-sectional sense to the advance of the roller to avoid splashes of the glue and to allow the immediate drying of the glue; thus, there is no any technological motivation to include a longitudinal groove on the solid rollers of the APA reference.

Anderson Reference

The Anderson reference teaches the fabrication of big reels of tissue paper or silk that will be sub-divided into smaller reels. Mini points of glue that are applied between the diverse layers into the entire sheets. The mini points are applied to include air and to give volume to the resulting reel to form patterns characteristic of each manufacturer. Anderson provides the glue by means of a roller which includes mini projections in combination with another roller with projections to press in the points where it has given the glue.

In view of the above, Applicant notes the Anderson et al. reference does not teach section a) of the claims that is the section that describes the system of gluing of the bottoms and the reinforcement strip.

The Examiner cited the Anderson reference to show the teaching of a plate having crest and valleys and adding the glue only to the crest of the plate.

Applicant notes that the Anderson et al. reference indeed teaches a roller having protrusions forming crests and valleys. In addition, the reference teaches that the glue is applied only to the crests of the protrusions.

Combining APA and Anderson et al.

The Examiner is of the opinion that it would be obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the present invention was made to modify the APA reference by adding protuberances to the roller (Anderson et al.) in order to provide good ply-bonding and maintain good sheet strength.

Applicant notes that the Anderson et al. reference does not overcome the deficiencies of the APA reference because the Anderson et al. reference **also** fails to teach: 1) the crests of the roller are disposed longitudinally in the direction of rotation of

the gluing roller applicator; 2) the gluing points are **raised** from the surface of the ruler guide, and 3) the gluing points further comprise a longitudinal groove (Claim 19).

Applicant notes that the Anderson et al. reference teaches that the crest of the protrusions of the roller form embossed patterns around all the surfaces of the sheets. (See page 3 lines 6-10; page 4, lines 15-22; page 5, lines 10-22).

The reference is silent regarding that the crests of the roller are disposed **longitudinally in the direction** of rotation of the gluing roller applicator. This is true because the Anderson reference is directed to the formation of patterns on the tissue paper sheets and the crest of the protuberance form the pattern and are localized in specific positions depending on the pattern to be formed and not to reinforce the sheets to obtain a strong bag.

On the contrary, the present invention is directed to the formation of bags and to unite the sheets of paper that are going to form the bottom of a bag, the glue is dosed by means of rollers having protuberances with crests that are disposed longitudinally in the direction of rotation of the gluing roller applicator.

The longitudinal orientation of the crest forms a pattern of lines in the sheet. The line patterns provide strength to the bottom of the bag.

Because the Anderson et al. reference is not directed to the fabrication of bags, the reference does not have any motivation to place the gluing points longitudinally in the direction of rotation of the gluing roller applicator because the reference only wants to form a pattern.

In addition, Applicant notes that the Anderson reference fails to teach a ruler guide having the gluing points that are **raised** from the surface of the ruler guide or a longitudinal groove (Claim 19).

In view of the above, neither of the APA and/ or the Anderson et al. references, taken alone or in combination, teach all the elements of the present invention as presently claimed because both references fail to teach that the crests of the roller are disposed longitudinally in the direction of rotation of the gluing roller applicator; 2) the gluing points are **raised** from the surface of the ruler guide, and 3) the gluing points further comprise a longitudinal groove (Claim 19).

Furthermore, there is not any technological motivation to modify the APA reference by adding protuberances to the roller as suggested by the Examiner because the modification will require a complete mechanical re-design of the system according to the APA in order to accommodate the protuberances on the roller. The re-design will destroy the feature of the APA reference.

The above is impermissible according to 103.

Regarding Claim 20, neither of the cited reference taken alone or in combination teach only what is encompassed by Claim 20, because both reference have more elements than what is required by Claim 20.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Favorable consideration and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. Should further issues remain prior to allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn A. Defillo

DEFILLO & ASSOCIATES
P. O. Box 14104
Clearwater, FL 33766

727 772-5916 telephone

Evelyn A. Defillo
Registration No. 45,630

Date: May 29, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF FILING

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing AMENDMENT A for U.S. Application No. 10/579,031 filed May 11, 2006, was electronically filed addressed: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 29, 2009.

Evelyn A. Defillo